UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/596,703 | 06/22/2006 | Anthony Morel | BWAC-30542 | 9744 |
| 27883 GRADY K. BE | 7590 08/17/201 RGEN | 0 | EXAMINER | |
| 3333 LEE PAR | KWAY | MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A | | |
| SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 7 | 75219 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3629 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/17/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MAIL@INVENTLEGAL.COM MAIL@GKBERGENLAW.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/596,703 | MOREL, ANTHONY | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Gabrielle McCormick | 3629 | | |

| | Gabrielle McCormick | 3629 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | unin the time period set forth in 37 v | CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | |
| 3. 🔲 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief. | will not be entered be | cause | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | TE below); | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | v); | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | otod oldiirio. | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | (| ,. | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an ex | kplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>17 and 26</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-26</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. | | | | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /Jamisue A. Plucinski/ | /G. M./ | | | | | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629 | Examiner, Art Unit 3629 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/596,703

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant's amendment to claim 21 does not overcome the previous rejection under 101 because the step of updating the profile on the apparatus is considered to be insufficient recitation of a machine.

Firstly, the apparatus is generically recited such that it covers any machine capable of storing a profile. Secondly, the steps of determining the alert level and weighting the feedback information are core to the performance of the method and are not recited as being performed by a particular machine.

With respect to amendments to claim 26, these require further consideration of whether new matter has been added as the specification and figures do not recite any structure that is clearly identified as a receiver, processor or updater.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant has requested consideration of documents listed in the Internation Search Report filed on June 22, 2006. The Examiner notes that copies of the references cited on the search report were not included, therefore considersation of the documents is precluded.